



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/666,503	09/19/2003	Jen-Lin Chao	252011-1660	8959

47390 7590 04/19/2007  
THOMAS, KAYDEN, HOSTEMEYER & RISLEY LLP  
100 GALLERIA PARKWAY  
SUITE 1750  
ATLANTA, GA 30339

EXAMINER
----------

BELL, CORY C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2164

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	04/19/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/666,503

Applicant(s)

CHAO ET AL.

Examiner

Cory C. Bell

Art Unit

2164

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 February 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-13, 15-21, 23, 24 and 26-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-13, 15-21, 23-24, and 26-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.


**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

  
**SAM RIMELL**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-3, 5-13, 15-21, 23-24, and 26-30 have been examined.
2. Claims 4, 14, 22, 25 are cancelled

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

- a. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-13, 15-17, 19-21, 23-24, 26-28, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Number 6567928, known hereafter as Lyle, in view of "Ten Minute Guide to Excel 97", known hereafter as Fulton.

Claim 1 is rejected for the following reasons:

A system of data management for a plurality of correlated

data records, comprising:

a data verification module, verifying the data records according to the data correlations and producing a plurality of verification results, each of the verification results corresponds to one of the data records(Figure 11);

a data notation module, coupled to the data verification module, noting the verification results in the corresponding data records(Col 6 lines 48-510) ; and

a data management module, coupled to the data notation module, managing the data records according to the verification results(Col 6 lines 54-57)

Art Unit: 2164

wherein each of the verification results includes one of valid and invalid, each of the verification result includes valid for the corresponding data record when the corresponding data record can be applied to a data application module and each of the verification result includes invalid for the corresponding data record when the corresponding data record can not be applied to the data application module.(Col 6 lines 48-63)

Lyle fails to expressly disclose Sequential correlations in the database system as claimed, “the second record is made available only after the first data record is available” however this is taught in Fulton page 6 “Error”. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the inventions to use these correlations when invalidating records, as records that are dependant upon a record must themselves be invalid, and these types of records are well known and provide increased functionality in data manipulation in a database.

4. Claim 2 is rejected for the following reasons:

The system as claimed in claim 1, further comprising the data application module, coupled to the data verification module and the data notation module, applying the data records whose verification results include valid. (Col 6 lines 57-63)

5. Claim 3 is rejected for the following reasons:

6. 3. The system as claimed in claim 2, wherein the data correlations are established according to correlations between the data records applied to the data application modules (Data inherently has correlations for example Col 6 lines 61-63, talks about the object being in a table and thus having correlations).

7. Claim 5 is rejected for the following reasons:

Art Unit: 2164

5. (Currently Amended) The system as claimed in claim 3, one data correlation of a third of the data records and a fourth of the data records being parallel only indicates that the third data record and the fourth data record must be prepared before applying to the data application module, but there are no correlation between the third data record and the fourth data record. (The cited sections of Lyle. records don't show sequential-dependence and are therefore parallel only as there are no correlations) Page 7 of Fulton shows both parallel only and sequential data record.

8. Claim 6 is rejected for the following reasons:

one data correlation of a third of the data records, a fourth of the data records, and a fourth of the data records being both sequential and parallel indicates that the fifth data record is valid only after the third data record and the fourth data record are valid for applying to the data application module, and the data correlation between fourth data record and the fifth data record is parallel. (See Claim 5 rejection, on page 7 record 13D 14D and 15D are parallel, and 17D is sequentially correlated to 13D 14D and 15D).

9. Claim 7 is rejected for the following reasons:

10. 7. The system as claimed in claim 1, wherein each data record has a data record owner.  
(Data records inherently have an Owner).

11. Claim 9 is rejected for the following reasons:

12. The system as claimed in claim 7, wherein data management is enabled by the data  
13. management module deleting the data records (Col 8 lines 31-34).

14. Claim 10 is rejected for the following reasons:

15. 10. The system as claimed in claim 1, wherein the data records are stored in at least one  
database (Col 7 lines 11-18).

16. **Claim 11** is rejected for the following reasons:

17. See claim 1 rejection.

18. **Claim 12** is rejected for the following reasons:

Art Unit: 2164

19. See claim 2 rejection.
20. **Claim 13** is rejected for the following reasons:
21. See claim 3 rejection.
22. **Claim 14** is rejected for the following reasons:
23. See claim 4 rejection.
24. **Claim 15** is rejected for the following reasons:
25. See claim 5 rejection.
26. **Claim 16** is rejected for the following reasons:
27. See claim 6 rejection.
28. **Claim 17** is rejected for the following reasons:
29. See claim 7 rejection.
30. **Claim 19** is rejected for the following reasons:
31. See claim 9 rejection.
32. **Claim 20** is rejected for the following reasons:
33. See claim 10 rejection.

34. **Claim 21** is rejected for the following reasons:

35. A database, comprising: a data storage module, storing a plurality of correlated data records, and a data operation module, coupled to the data storage module, operating the data records(*Figure 4*).

36. **Claim 22** is rejected for the following reasons:

37. See claim 1 rejection.

38. **Claim 23** is rejected for the following reasons:

39. See claim 2 rejection.

40. **Claim 24** is rejected for the following reasons:

41. See claim 3 rejection.

42. **Claim 25** is rejected for the following reasons:

43. See claim 4 rejection.

44. **Claim 26** is rejected for the following reasons:

45. See claim 5 rejection.

46. **Claim 27** is rejected for the following reasons:

Art Unit: 2164

47. See claim 6 rejection.

48. **Claim 28** is rejected for the following reasons:

49. See claim 7 rejection.

50. **Claim 30** is rejected for the following reasons:

51. See claim 9 rejection.

52. Claims 8, 18, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Number 6567928, known hereafter as Lyle, in view of "Ten Minute Guide to Excel 97", known hereafter as Fulton in further view of US Patent Number 6978262, known hereafter as Tsai.

53. Claims 8, 18, and 19 are rejected for the following reasons:

Lyle and Fulton teaches the claims upon when these claims are dependant, but fails to expressly disclose wherein data management is enabled by the data management module sending the verification results to the data record owners. This is taught however in Tsai (Col 10 lines 37-51). Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include these features, as they notify owners of invalid data so that valid data can be entered.

***Response to Arguments***



Art Unit: 2164

Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

*Conclusion*

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cory C. Bell whose telephone number is (571) 272 2736. The examiner can normally be reached on m-f 8:30-5:00.

Art Unit: 2164

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on (571) 272 4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



**SAM RIMELL  
PRIMARY EXAMINER**